

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 26-39 are pending. Claims 26-39 stand rejected.

**Section 102 Rejections**

Claims 36-38 have been rejected as being anticipated by Dunton. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is overcome for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 36 has now been amended to include features which are not suggested by the cited reference, namely:

- (h) **positioning the display between an eye of a user and a hand of the user;**
- (i) **viewing the at least one finger of the hand on the display, while forming the first and second hand patterns; and**
- (j) **visually aligning the eye of the user, the display and the first and second hand patterns.**

Basis for amended claim 36 may be seen, for example, in Fig. 8 and Fig. 9(a). As shown, the display is positioned **between the eye of the user and the hand of the user**. At least one finger of the hand is viewed on the display (as shown in Fig. 9(a)) while, at the same time, forming a first or second hand pattern (as shown in Figs. 9(a) and 9(b)). Finally, **the eye of the user and the first and second hand patterns are aligned with the display**, as shown, for example, in Fig. 8. As shown, the **left eye, the display and the hand/forefinger are placed in alignment**, in other words, **visual alignment**.

Dunton discloses imaging by a camera a first hand pattern and a second hand pattern. Dunton further discloses recognizing the hand patterns and controlling information on the display using these hand patterns. Dunton also discloses, in Figs. 1-3, sensor 28 imaging virtual keyboard and mouse 34a, b. The user observes the results of his hand patterns by viewing display 18. Although not shown, the user observes display 18 while his hand patterns are positioned below a line of sight between the user and display 18. Accordingly, Dunton does **not** disclose **positioning the display between the eye of a user and the hand of a user.**

Dunton discloses positioning the hand of the user between the display and the eye of the user. Furthermore, Dunton **cannot view at least one finger of the hand on the display while forming the hand patterns.** Dunton discloses viewing the **results** of the actions of the fingers on the display, and **cannot view at least one finger on the display, while forming the hand patterns.**

Furthermore, **Dunton does not visually align the eye of the user, the display, and the first and second hand patterns.** As already stated, Dunton discloses that the hand patterns on the virtual keyboard are likely out of visual alignment between the eye of the user and display 18.

Favorable reconsideration is requested for amended claim 36. Claims 37 and 39 depend from claim 36 and are, therefore, not subject to rejection in view of the cited reference for at least the same reasons set forth for amended claim 36.

Newly added claim 40 depends from claim 38 and recites the following features:

- superimposing a cursor on the display surface of the projection micro display to control the information;
- **visually observing both the cursor and a hand/finger forming the first pattern and the second pattern, and**
- **moving both the cursor and the hand/finger imaged on the display** to control the information on the display.

Neither Dunton, nor the other cited references disclose **visually observing both the cursor and a hand/finger, and moving both the cursor and the hand/finger imaged on the display** to control the information on the display.

As shown, for example, in Figs. 10(b) and 10(d), the invention advantageously provides a visual observation of both the cursor and the finger/hand, as both are shown on the display. This advantage of observing both the finger/hand and the cursor on the display is not suggested by any of the cited references. Favorable consideration is requested for newly added claim 40.

### **Section 103 Rejections**

Claims 26-35 and 39 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Dunton in view of Gale and Nishiyama. Claims 29-34 have been rejected over similar art and, further, in view of Sigel. Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections are overcome for the reasons set forth below.

Amended claim 26 includes features similar to the added features of amended claim 36, namely:

- (h) positioning the display between an eye of a user and a hand of the user;
- (i) viewing the at least one finger of the hand on the display, while forming the first and second hand patterns; and
- (j) visually aligning the eye of the user, the display and the first and second hand patterns.

The Response to the previous Office Action, dated November 19, 2003, discussed the references of Sigel, Gale and Nishiyama. That discussion is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety.

Neither Sigel, Gale nor Nishiyama disclose or suggest the features of amended claim 26.

As discussed above, Dunton does **not** disclose any of the features of **positioning the display between the eye of the user and the hand of the user**. Dunton, furthermore, does **not** disclose **viewing at least one finger of the hand on the display while also forming the first and second hand patterns**. Furthermore, Dunton does **not visually align the eye of the user, the display and the first and second hand patterns**.

Favorable reconsideration is requested for amended claim 26. Claims 27-35 depend from amended claim 26 and are, therefore, not subject to rejection in view of the cited references for at least the same reasons set forth for amended claim 36.


Application No.: 09/824,397  
Amendment Dated: August 27, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of: May 27, 2004

MTS-3247US

**Conclusion**

Claims 26-39 are in condition for allowance. Newly added dependent claim 40 is also in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel N. Calder, Reg. 27,424  
Jack J. Jankovitz, Reg. No. 42,690  
Attorneys for Applicant

JJJ/fp/ds

Dated: August 27, 2004

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980  
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

August 27, 2004



DLM\_I:\MTS\3247US\AMEND\_03.DOC